DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 457 792 HE 034 457

TITLE	Higher Education Counts: Accountability Measures for the New Millennium. Public Act 99-285 Progress Report.
INSTITUTION	Connecticut State Dept. of Higher Education, Hartford.
PUB DATE	2000-02-01
NOTE	57p.; For subsequent progress reports, see HE 034 458 and 035 464.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.ctdhe.org.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; Educational Objectives; Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Measurement Techniques; Program Development; *Public Colleges; State Legislation; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*Connecticut

ABSTRACT

Connecticut's Public Act 99-285 clarifies the major goals and expectations that Connecticut citizens have for their public system of higher education. In this Act, the state legislature has codified its desires by identifying six priority level goals for higher education: (1) enhance student learning and promote academic excellence; (2) join with elementary and secondary schools to improve teaching and learning; (3) ensure access to and affordability of higher education; (4) promote the economic development of the state; (5) respond to the needs and problems of society; and (6) ensure the efficient use of resources. The Act charges the Higher Education Coordinating Council (HECC) with developing accountability measures for each constituent unit and each public institution of higher education in Connecticut. This document represents the Commissioner of Higher Education's progress report on developing and implementing the accountability measures. Section 2 of this report contains the first iteration of measures, which were approved by the Board of Governors on January 26, 2000. It identifies some 180 accountability measures, but the HECC recognizes that better outcome measures are required, especially in the area of assessing student learning. To carry out the mandate of the legislature and to enhance the development of accountability measures, the Commissioner recommends the creation of a performance incentive pool for implementation to fund institutions based on their progress in demonstrating performance and meeting goals. The Commissioner also calls for a refocus of the biennial budget request, the link of the review of accountability reports to the budgeting process, and the replacement of the statutory biennial reports requirement with annual report. Attachments include a list of members of the performance measures task force, a policy statement by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, the peer institution selection criteria used in developing the accountability measures, and a timeline for the implementation of the measures. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Report

February 1, 2000

Board of Governors for Higher Education
Department of Higher Education
State of Connecticut

ED 457 792

Higher Education Counts:

Accountability Measures for the New Millennium

Public Act 99-285
Progress Report

J Zikmund

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

61 Woodland Street
Hartford, Connecticut
06105-2391

860-947-1848
www.ctdhe.commnet.edu

HE033457

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Board of Governors for Higher Education

Albert Vertefeuille, *Chair*

Harry H. Penner, *Vice Chair*

James H. Bates

William A. Bevacqua

Dorothea E. Brennan

Leonard S. Cohen

Lile R. Gibbons

Joan R. Kemler

Dorothy B. Leib

Alice V. Meyer

Patricia McCann Vissepó

Valerie F. Lewis
Interim Commissioner of Higher Education

HE 034457

Executive Summary

Connecticut's public higher education system is a vital public enterprise that, like other systems across the nation, has multiple purposes, goals and expectations. These include, among other things, the education and training of students for future success; research, development and dissemination of new knowledge; public service in the form of cultural events, community assistance and outreach.

Importantly, Public Act 99-285 clarifies the major goals and expectations that Connecticut citizens have for their public system of higher education. In some respects, this is the first time that Connecticut, through the action of its legislature, has endeavored to codify its desires by identifying six priority state level goals. Specifically, these goals are to:

1. **enhance student learning and promote academic excellence;**
2. **join with elementary and secondary schools to improve teaching and learning at all levels;**
3. **ensure access to and affordability of higher education;**
4. **promote the economic development of the state to help business and industry sustain strong economic growth;**
5. **respond to the needs and problems of society; and**
6. **ensure the efficient use of resources**

The act charges the Higher Education Coordinating Council (HECC) with developing accountability measures for each constituent unit and each public institution of higher education that must be approved by the Board of Governors for Higher Education (Board of Governors).

This document represents the Commissioner of Higher Education's progress report on developing and implementing the accountability measures. The first iteration of measures, approved by the Board of Governors on January 26th, 2000, is contained in Section II of the report. These measures should be viewed as positive steps in the right direction, but with the recognition that additional work needs to be done.

The HECC has committed itself to pursuing better outcome measures, particularly in the area of assessing student learning. It will consider both qualitative and quantitative measures, and has not ruled out the possibility of adopting the use of some standardized testing. It is in the process of identifying a set of peer institutions to compare and benchmark performance, and establishing performance goals on many of the measures. In addition, the Board of Governors has asked that the measures be improved and expanded upon, with particular attention given to making the information understandable to the public, evaluating distance learning opportunities, assessing technology learning and literacy, and ensuring more consistency among constituent units. A preliminary timeline for addressing these and other development issues is contained in Attachment D.

Despite the many real and perceived impediments to accountability measurement in higher education, the measurement products contained in this report demonstrate that consistent commitment from state policymakers does make a difference. Higher education has gained

significant momentum in focusing its efforts on performance improvement. To promote the further advancement of these efforts, the Commissioner recommends the following additional incentives and a sustained focus on performance improvement, as explained further in Section VII of the report:

1. **Create a performance incentive pool for implementation in the first year of the next biennium that provides incentive funds to institutions based on progress in demonstrating performance and meeting performance goals.**

2. **Refocus consolidated biennial budget request to emphasis performance improvement, incorporating results of accountability reports.**

3. **Link the review of these reports with biennial budgeting process**

4. **Eliminate the statutory biennial assessment report requirement and replace it with annual accountability measurement reports**

Introduction

Connecticut's public higher education system is a vital public enterprise that, like other systems across the nation, has multiple purposes, goals and expectations. These include, among other things, the education and training of students for future success; research, development and dissemination of new knowledge; public service in the form of cultural, entertainment and athletic events; and community assistance and outreach. As such, the system often confronts competing demands, priorities and choices that require skillful leadership and direction to navigate and manage to best effect.

Importantly, Public Act 99-285 clarifies the major goals and expectations that Connecticut citizens have for their public system of higher education. In some respects, this is the first time that Connecticut, through the action of its legislature, has endeavored to codify its desires by identifying six priority state level goals. Specifically, these goals are to:

1. enhance student learning and promote academic excellence;
2. join with elementary and secondary schools to improve teaching and learning at all levels;
3. ensure access to and affordability of higher education;
4. promote the economic development of the state to help business and industry sustain strong economic growth;
5. respond to the needs and problems of society; and
6. ensure the efficient use of resources

Identification of these goals helps to reaffirm the state's commitment to provide taxpayer-generated financial support for this system. The higher education community appreciates the recognition of its critical role in the overall health and growth of the state, and welcomes the opportunity to improve performance and more fully demonstrate its many contributions.

Specific Charge Under 99-285

Public Act 99-285 charges the Higher Education Coordinating Council (HECC) with developing accountability measures for each constituent unit and each public institution of higher education. These measures must be approved by the Board of Governors for Higher Education (Board of Governors), and used by the Department of Higher Education and each constituent unit in assessing progress toward meeting the six identified statewide goals. The HECC also is directed to develop an implementation plan for use of the accountability measures.

In developing the measures, the act asks the HECC to consider graduation rates, student retention rates, tuition and fees, student financial need and available aid, trends in enrollment, strategic plans, degrees conferred by program, faculty productivity, and any other factors it deems relevant.

Finally, the act requires the Commissioner of Higher Education to report by February 1, 2000 on the progress in developing the measures and the implementation plan. This document represents that progress report.

The Report Format

The first section of the report includes a more detailed discussion on the accountability measurement process. This is followed by the list of the approved measures provided in table form by constituent unit and, within unit, by goal. Section III describes the process under way to identify a set of comparison, or peer, institutions that will be used to establish performance benchmarks and improvement goals for each of our public institutions. The Board approved this set of prototypes on January 26th, 2000 and, in its action, made some specific comments and recommendations that are contained in Section IV. Section V outlines the specific commitment made by members of the HECC to promote the development of more meaningful accountability mechanisms, particularly those that measure student learning outcomes. Section VI contains a preliminary timeline for collecting baseline and comparative data, setting performance improvement goals, developing a reporting format and completing the first accountability reports. The final section contains the Commissioner's recommendations for streamlining current reporting requirements, enhancing efforts to encourage performance improvement and modifying current budget development processes.

I. Accountability Measures Development Process

The development of the proposed accountability measures actually began a year prior to the enactment of PA 99-285 when the Board of Governors established its own Performance Measures Task Force (PMTF). Based on the recommendations made by its Public Agenda Advisory Council in April 1998, the Board directed the PMTF to develop performance measures for each of Connecticut's higher education institutions. In identifying these measures, the group was urged to choose or develop measures that would be meaningful to external constituencies, including state policymakers, alumni and donors, and the general public. Following the enactment of the new legislation last spring, the HECC then asked this group to continue its work under the new and expanded definition of statewide goals. A synopsis of the work of this group, along with a current membership list, can be found in Attachment A. Representatives of the Office of Policy and Management and the Office of Fiscal Analysis participated in the meetings and discussions of the PMTF on a regular basis.

It is important to note that the development of these performance measures has not been an isolated or new activity. Each constituent unit of higher education has been engaged in institutional assessment activities, at least formally, since 1989 under a policy directive of the Board of Governors that called for the submission of biennial reports on assessment progress beginning in 1992. This process was later codified under Public Act 93-201, with an expansion of the areas to be reported. All institutions have fully participated and complied with these mandates. More recently, all campuses are preparing to meet new outcome standard requirements for re-accreditation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) (see Attachment B), the standards on which the Board of Governors bases its licensure approval.

Also, during the 1990s, higher education was part of at least two statewide efforts to identify performance measures. The first, required by Public Act 92-8 and directed by the Office of Policy and Management, resulted in the identification of a limited number of measures concerning the primary mission areas of instruction, research and public service that currently are reported as part of biennial operating budget requests. The other, emanating out of the work of the Progress Council created in 1993, but abandoned before any actual reporting, set 300 broad statewide benchmarks for performance improvement for state government in five areas: families and communities, education, health, the economy, and the environment.

While these efforts made important contributions to thinking about how to demonstrate performance and improvement, neither resulted in policy changes affecting resource allocation decisions. In addition, both were focused at the constituent unit or system level and neither called for individual institutions to identify or report on performance. These are key differences from the charge provided under Public Act 99-285.

The task of identifying, prioritizing and evaluating performance of higher education's many products and outcomes is a complicated and challenging task. In many areas such as assessing learning outcomes, faculty productivity and administrative efficiency, there are few, if any, standards or national benchmarks of performance to rely upon. While more than 75 percent of

states are engaged in some kind of performance reporting, all continue to experience difficulty in adequately quantifying the many benefits of a higher education experience, and of the programs and services offered by our colleges and universities. Yet, throughout this process, the HECC and the Board of Governors continue to exhibit a strong commitment to performance reporting and improvement.

The Board of Governors recognizes that the development of a sound accountability measurement system is a dynamic process. And while the accountability measures proposed here are the result of many months of good faith deliberation and reflect a broad spectrum of ideas, they still represent a starting point with much more deliberate work to be done. It will continue to encourage on-going dialogue on ways to improve our products and services and how these achievements are demonstrated.

II. The Proposed Measures

The measures adopted by the Board of Governors are listed in the following tables by constituent unit and, within unit, by goal. Beside each measure name is a clarifying question or statement, and a definition designed to assist the reader in understanding what is being measured. These approved lists have gone through many iterations and revisions during the review process. At the urging of the Board of Governors early in the process, all units conferred internally with faculty and staff representatives during the fall and winter months before bringing suggested measures forward to the PMTF. Next, the PMTF reviewed and recommended changes to each member's proposals based on a system level perspective. Lastly, HECC asked for additional emphasis to be made on assessing student outcomes and unit to unit comparability. The Council also sought review and commentary by the Standing Advisory Committee of the Board of Governors on measures concerning faculty productivity.

Please note that in addition to specific measures for each of the six statutory goal areas, each unit was asked to consider adding other measures that address specific internal strategic planning initiatives. These measures are intended to demonstrate progress in areas deemed important to the further improvement of an individual unit or campus, but which may not be meaningful to an external audience. This additional section was added as a way of balancing among units the total number of measures identified under the six statutory goal areas.

When reviewing the proposed measures, it also should be noted that Connecticut's higher education consists of four subsystems: the University of Connecticut and its Health Center that are charged to emphasize first professional and doctoral education, as well as research; the Connecticut State University that provides comprehensive four-year and masters level education and a focus on applied research; the Community-Technical Colleges that offer educational and occupational training opportunities at the two-year level; and Charter Oak State College, an external degree granting institution. While these systems share some similarities in responsibilities and goals, each possesses important distinctions and unique missions that necessitate differences in programs and services. A major goal and challenge in developing accountability measures for the system, then, was to ensure as much consistency and similarity as possible, while still allowing each unit to showcase its important distinctions and priorities.

Some of the measures listed in the tables that follow require data that is already collected and, in some cases, reported on by our colleges and universities. Other measures represent new information that needs to be developed and will not be reported on in the first round of accountability reports expected in the fall of 2000.

Participation by Connecticut Independent Colleges

Connecticut's independent sector has been participating in the work of the PMTF on a voluntary basis through representation from the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges and Trinity College. Their contributions and perspectives on performance assessment have been extremely beneficial and appreciated by the task force. Thus far, they have agreed to report measures related to state supported student financial aid programs for the sector as a whole, but will not report any information by individual college. They also are willing to pursue discussions of other, potential measurement areas, again to be aggregated for the entire independent sector rather than by institution.

University of Connecticut

Goal 1: To enhance student learning and promote academic excellence		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
1.1 Proportion of graduating undergraduates completing university requirements for demonstrating written communication and quantitative analysis skills	Do UConn graduates demonstrate competence in written and oral communication, critical analysis and logic thinking, use of scientific and quantitative skills, and the ability to acquire new skills and knowledge?	Completion of UConn General Education Writing and Quantitative Requirements
1.2 Passing rates in licensure and certification examinations	Are graduating students prepared to practice their professions?	E.g.: CPA, Physical Therapy, RN exams
1.3 Student satisfaction: **a. Self-reports of the quality of the educational experience** **b. With instruction**	How do students regard the quality of their educational experience?	a. "Quality" is self-assessed by students and alumni(ae) and relates to outputs in areas such as analytical thinking and communication skills b. "Student Satisfaction" means student/teacher evaluation results
1.4 Total research expenditures	How is academic excellence achieved through research endeavors?	Includes expenditures from all funding sources
1.5 Number of annual publications per faculty member	What output measure of research endeavors do we have?	Publications means intellectual contributions in print

Goal 2: To join with elementary and secondary schools to improve teaching and learning at all levels		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
2.1 Percent of graduates employed as teachers	What proportion of graduates are employed as public school teache s?	Survey questions
2.2 Percentage of Connecticut superintendents and principals of schools who have degrees from UConn	What has the impact of the institution been on the administration of school districts?	Includes undergraduate and graduate degrees
2.3 Collaborative activities and programs supported by UConn in Connecticut public schools	How does UConn interact with Connecticut school districts?	"Professional Development Centers" (PDC's) are the Connecticut school districts in which students' clinical experiences take place
2.4 UConn professional volunteer contributions to Connecticut public schools	How are individual UConn faculty and staff enhancing Connecticut K-12 education?	"Volunteer" means any person who performs services without remuneration

University of Connecticut

Goal 3: To ensure access to and affordability of higher education		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
3.1 Real price to students to attend institution	Are UConn's tuition and fee rates becoming more or less affordable to Connecticut residents?	Price as percent of state median family income
3.2 Percent of operating expenditures from state support	What is the level of state financial commitment to ensuring access and affordability to UConn?	Ratio of state support to operating expenditure
3.3 Percent of financial aid from state support	To what extent does the state provide student financial assistance to students attending UConn?	Ratio of state support for financial aid to total aid
3.4 The amount of aid per undergraduate and graduate student	How well is the institution meeting the financial aid needs of its students?	Indicates the level of assistance given to UConn students
3.5 The numbers and proportion of underrepresented minorities	How does the ethnic composition of the student body compare to that of the state?	"Underrepresented minorities" means that an ethnic background percentage is greater in the general state population than in the UConn student body
3.6 Total enrollment in non-degree and non-credit courses and workshops	Are the needs of "life long learners" being addressed?	Non-degree and non-credit courses do not count towards earning a degree in higher education
3.7 Total funding for graduate students	Are most graduate students in research oriented degrees such as the PhD obtaining financial support to conduct their studies?	"Graduate assistantships" allow students to subsist while obtaining advance degrees
3.8 Total amount of merit based aid	Is there financial support for the "best and brightest"?	Merit based aid means financial support given on the basis of outstanding achievement in a field, not financial need
3.9 Percent of tuition income devoted to all forms of financial aid	How well is the institution meeting the financial aid needs of its students?	"Financial aid" includes scholarships, grants in aid and work study supports/employment

University of Connecticut

Goal 4: To promote the economic development of the state and to help business and industry sustain economic growth		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
4.1 Percent business employers satisfied with competence of graduates	Are business employers satisfied with graduates of institutions?	Survey questions on level of satisfaction
4.2 Total research income	What is the magnitude of research endeavors at the State's public Carnegie 1 Research university?	Includes grants and contracts from public and private sources
4.3 Number of patents and inventions	How is innovation contributing to the economy?	Intellectual property contributes to economic development
4.4 Contracts and grants leading to licenses of intellectual property	How is intellectual property created through research funded by grants and contracts?	Includes grants and contracts from public and private sources
4.5 The number of collaborations and partnerships that lead to enhanced opportunities for development with business partners; and small business served annually	How do UConn partnerships with business partners promote economic development?	May include joint ventures, independent contracting and spin-off companies "Small business" as defined by the federal Small Business Administration

University of Connecticut

Goal 5: To respond to the needs and problems of society		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
5.1 Number of internships, cooperative experiences and clinical placements by students; and of community services activities by students and/or student organizations	How can student activities contribute to economic development and the betterment of society?	Includes paid or unpaid student temporary placement under University auspices including any type of "community outreach" activities, paid or unpaid
5.2 Percent non-business employers satisfied with competence of graduates	Are non- –business employers satisfied with graduates of institutions?	Survey questions on level of satisfaction
5.3 Instances of professional public service by UConn professional staff	How does professional service contributes to societal needs?	Includes consulting, paid or pro bono, or volunteer activities etc…
5.4 Service to entrepreneurial activities, and societal and health issues	How does UConn encourage innovation and growth?	Entrepreneurial activities = start up business ventures Societal issues = challenges facing the growth, safety and development of civil society
5.6 Instances of public officials' training and education	How does UConn help educate and train public officials?	"Public officials" means elective or appointive officials or public employees
5.7 Publications that support the public good	How are UConn publications supporting the public good?	"Publications" include both for profit and not for profit
5.8 Contributions to Connecticut cultural and recreational life	How does UConn contribute to the welfare of society through arts and culture?	Includes all types of cultural expressions, including literature and the arts; also recreational activities such as sports events

University of Connecticut

Goal 6: To ensure the efficient use of resources		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
6.1 Percent of operating expenditures for instruction, academic support and student services	Does UConn focus its resources on its primary instructional, academic and student support missions?	Ratio of operating expenses for instruction, academic support and student services to all expenditures
6.2 Faculty workload, productivity, faculty time	How do faculty spend their professional time?	Professional time includes teaching, research and service activities
6.3 First and second year retention rates for undergraduates	How well are we managing out human capital investment?	Retention rates indicate the percentage of originally matriculated persons who are retained in the system
6.4 Graduation rates: **a. in six years for undergraduates** **b. in four years for master's students** **c. in eight years for doctoral students**	What percentage of undergraduate students are graduating in a relatively timely manner?	Completion of degree requirements within six years for undergraduate students, four years for master's students and eight years for doctoral students
6.5 The number of transfer students from the CTC system who graduate from UConn, by specific CTC	How well is the institution serving the needs of students who begin their education at a Community Technical College?	A joint measure of CTC campus sources
6.6 Percent of total institutional budget generated from non-state general fund sources	How do entrepreneurial and educational activities allow expansion of the university mission at no additional cost to the taxpayers?	Includes all non-state general fund appropriations, including tuition funds, auxiliary funds, and grants and contracts
6.7 Percent of budget expended on administrative, academic and other functions	How does allocation of resources support the university mission?	See CGS "Administrative cap" definition of administrative functions
6.8 Ratio of administrators to total staff	What proportion of Uconn staff is devoted to administration?	"Administrators" = see IPEDS definition

University of Connecticut
Strategic Performance Indicators

7.1 Proportion of graduating undergraduates whose education has included a research experience

7.2 Proportion of undergraduates involved in structured living/learning environments

7.3 Proportion of first year undergraduates involved in the first year experience

7.4 Number of Connecticut high school valedictorians in freshman class

7.5 Proportion of education students incorporating a research component into their course work

7.6 Percentage of UConn students in placements in urban schools and/or working with special needs children

7.7 Collaboration among UConn; the business community; education districts and educational councils; and the Connecticut Department of Education

7.8a Increase in number of Connecticut students served at UConn

7.8b Number of out-of-state students at UConn as a percentage of the number of Connecticut students who go out-of-state

UConn Health Center

Goal 1: To enhance student learning and promote academic excellence		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
1.1 Performance on National and State Boards (required for licensing)	Are our students adequately prepared to pass licensure examinations?	School of Medicine (SOM), School of Dental Medicine (SODM): average scores, pass rates
1.2 Residency program or job placement	Are our students successfully obtaining post-graduate training positions and/or employment?	SOM: Percent who enter residency programs, Percent who obtain one of their top 3 choices; SODM: Percent obtaining residency position Ph.D.: Percent employed (broken down into academic, commercial, governmental or other positions)
1.3 Student satisfaction after graduation	Are students satisfied with the education they have received?	Satisfaction with the quality of education provided; belief that the education provided adequately prepared the student for post-graduate training
1.4 Research success of the faculty	Is there an active, high quality research program in place to enhance the academic environment?	Number of peer reviewed articles published reported by subgroups: basic science faculty clinical scientists, and Ph.D. candidates
1.5 Student participation in research projects	Is there an active, high quality research program in place to enhance the academic environment?	Number of students participating in a significant research project under the leadership of the faculty reported in the following subgroups of students: M.D., D.M.D, MPH, and Ph.D.
1.6 Library materials	Is the library of sufficient size and diversity to support the academic environment?	Number of library holdings and rate of new acquisitions reported in the following subgroups: journals, monographs, computer software and audio-visuals - in print or on-line

UConn Health Center

Goal 1: To enhance student learning and promote academic excellence		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
1.7 List and description of initiatives related to this goal and assessments of them	Has significant progress been made recently in improving the quality of the student learning experience or in promoting academic excellence?	To be determined with the implementation of each unique initiative

Goal 2: To join with elementary and secondary schools to improve teaching and learning at all levels		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
2.1 List and description of initiatives related to this goal and assessments of them	Is the institution involved in activities that will help improve teaching and learning at the elementary and secondary school levels?	To be determined with the implementation of each unique initiative, but to include a description of the program and measures of involvement by faculty and students

Goal 3: To ensure access to and affordability of higher education		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
3.1 Percent of enrolling class who are State residents	Do State residents have access to this institution?	Percent of admitted class who are state or regional residents; rate of offers given for applicants from the state
3.2 Percent of the enrolling class who are women and/or under-represented minorities	Do women and under-represented minorities have access to this institution?	Percent of admitted class who are women or under-represented minorities; rate of offers given for such groups
3.3a Cost of education to the student	Is matriculation affordable?	Tuition and fees
3.3b Cost of education to the under-represented minority student	Can under-represented minorities afford to matriculate?	Financial aid provided to under-represented minorities

Goal 4: To promote the economic development of the state and to help business and industry sustain economic growth		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
4.1 Non-general fund income	In addition to state funds, how much revenue is generated and then spent in the state economy?	Non-general fund income reported from research grants & contracts; patents & inventions; and clinical sources
4.2 Participation in State sponsored academic – business partnerships	To what degree does the institution participate in state sponsored programs supporting business and industry?	Number and amount of grants and programs
4.3 List and description of initiatives related to this goal and assessments of them	Is the institution involved in partnerships and activities that will promote the growth of business and industry in the State?	To be determined with the implementation of each unique initiative

Goal 5: To respond to the needs and problems of society		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
5.1 Utilization of patient services.	To what degree does the institution support the clinical needs of the citizens of Connecticut?	Inpatient: patient beds/year Ambulatory / medical: visits /year Ambulatory / dental: visits/year
5.2 Attendance at health education presentations	To what degree are the health educational needs of public being addressed?	Person-hours of attendance reported for the following subgroups: continuing medical education, continuing dental education, continuing health professional education, general public education
5.3 List and description of initiatives related to this goal and assessments of them	Is the institution involved in addressing the special needs and problems of society?	To be determined with the implementation of each unique initiative

UConn Health Center

Goal 6: To ensure the efficient use of resources		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
6.1 Return on Investment	Is there an appropriate return on investment for the State's support of the institution?	(Total revenue generated)/(state funds provided to the institution)
6.2 Graduation rates	How efficient is the institution in producing its primary product (i.e. graduates)?	Percentage of incoming classes that graduate within a reasonable time frame reported for the following subgroups: MDs, DMDs, Ph.Ds (within 6 years), MD/Ph.D (within 8 years), MPH (within 6 years)
6.3 Faculty salaries	Are the faculty being paid at an appropriate level?	Distributions of faculty salaries reported in the following subgroups: basic science, clinical, SOM and SODM

Connecticut State University

Goal 1: To enhance student learning and promote academic excellence		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
1.1 Percent of graduates demonstrating in-depth understanding of an area of knowledge	Do CSU graduates demonstrate in-depth understanding of their major area of study?	Demonstrated performance on licensure and certification exams and other instruments developed for non-professional fields with reference to NEASC or professional standards
1.2 Percent of graduates demonstrating competence in an ability to: • **think critically, analytically and logically** • **write effectively** • **communicate well orally** • **use scientific and quantitative skills** • **acquire new skills and knowledge their own**	Do CSU graduates demonstrate competence in written and oral communication, critical analysis and logic thinking, use of scientific and quantitative skills, and the ability to acquire new skills and knowledge?	Demonstrated performance on qualitative or quantitative instrument with reference to NEASC standard
1.3 Percent of graduates who report their education enhanced their ability to: • **think critically, analytically and logically** • **write effectively** • **communicate well orally** • **use scientific and quantitative skills** • **acquire new skills and knowledge their own**	To what extent do graduates report positively on the outcomes they received from their education?	Percent of students self-reporting that their education had a positive impact on skills listed
1.4 Percent of incoming freshman who are CT residents	To what extent do CT residents chose to enroll in the institution?	Percent students indicating CT residence in information collected at enrollment
1.5 Percent of students needing remediation who meet outcome standards upon completion of remediation	To what extent are remediation programs successful?	Demonstrated performance on qualitative or quantitative instrument in comparison to outcome standards

Connecticut State University

Goal 2: To join with elementary and secondary schools to improve teaching and learning at all levels		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
2.1 Percent of graduates from teacher education programs employed as teachers	What proportion of graduates are employed as public school teachers?	Persons reporting employment as teachers five years after graduation
2.2 Percent of programs using assessment feedback to revise curriculum	What proportion of teacher education programs are employing assessment data?	Ratio of programs employing assessment data to curricular revisions to all programs
2.3 Number of partnerships or formal relationships with K-12 schools	To what extent are institutions connected with K-12 schools?	Tabulation of individual university relationships with a K-12 school

Goal 3: To ensure access to and affordability of higher education		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
3.1 Real price to students to attend institution	Are CSU's tuition and fee rates becoming more or less affordable to Connecticut residents?	Tuition and required fees as percent of state median family income
3.2 Percent of operating expenditures from state support	What is the level of state financial commitment to ensuring access and affordability to CSU?	Ratio of state support to operating expenditure
3.3 Percent of students whose financial aid needs are not met	What percentage of students have unmet needs for financial aid?	Federally defined total need for financial aid compared to total financial aid awarded
3.4 Percent of financial aid from state support	To what extent does the state provide student financial assistance to students attending CSU?	Ratio of state support for financial aid to total aid
3.5 Extent to which enrollment by ethnic group coincides with CT population characteristics	To what extent does the student population reflect the population of the state?	Percent of African-Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans in comparison to percentages in CT population

Goal 4: To promote the economic development of the state and to help business and industry sustain economic growth		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
4.1 Percent business employers satisfied with competence of graduates	Are business employers satisfied with graduates of institutions?	Percent of business employers expressing satisfaction in survey
4.2 Number of persons served by conferences, seminars, institutes, etc. produced or sponsored by CSU universities for business and corporations	To what extent are CSU institutions engaged in activities to support workforce development?	Tabulation of attendance at university events produced or sponsored for businesses or corporations
4.3 Percent of programs utilizing external feedback in curricular assessment	What proportion of business-related programs are employing assessment data?	Ratio of programs employing external feedback in curricular revisions to all programs

Goal 5: To respond to the needs and problems of society		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
5.1 Percent of faculty and staff engaged in community service activities	To what extent do faculty and staff engaged with the community?	Self reporting of community service activities
5.2 Percent of graduates who participated in community service, service learning, internships, cooperative education, practicums, etc.	To what extent do students engage with the community?	Self reporting by graduates on activities undertaken while students
5.3 Percent of non-business employers satisfied with competence of graduates	Are non-business employers satisfied with graduates of institutions?	Percent of non-business employers expressing satisfaction in survey
5.4 Percent of programs utilizing external feedback in curricular assessment	What proportion of non-business programs are employing assessment data?	Ratio of programs employing external feedback in curricular revisions to all programs

Connecticut State University

Goal 6: To ensure the efficient use of resources		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
6.1 Percent of operating expenditures for instruction, academic support and student services	Does CSU focus its resources on its primary instructional, academic and student services missions?	Ratio of operating expenses for instruction, academic support and student services to all expenditures
6.2 Faculty instructional productivity	Are faculty devoting sufficient time to direct instructional activity?	Number of load credits related to instruction carried annually by each FT faculty member
6.3 Retention rate	How well is CSU in retaining students from one year to the next?	First year students continuing in second year
6.4 Graduation rate	What percentage of undergraduate students are graduating in a relatively timely manner?	Six year completion rate
6.5 Real cost to students	How cost efficient is CSU in delivering its programs and services?	Ratio of total operating expenditures to full-time equivalent students with reference to consumer price index

Connecticut State University
Strategic Performance Indicators

7.1 Percent of graduates demonstrating the capability for continuing learning

7.2 Percent of graduates who report:
- satisfaction with the quality of classroom instruction
- satisfaction with the mastery gained in their major program of study
- willingness to recommend university

7.3 Percent of graduates applying to graduates school, law school or medical school who are admitted

7.4 Performance on licensure and certificate programs (non-teacher education students)

7.5 Number and percentage of programs with professional accreditation

7.6 Percent of graduates demonstrating competence as a teacher (pass rate on teacher exams)

7.7 Percent of in-service teachers continuing professional education at CSU universities

7.8 Number of relationships between CSU institutions and CT school districts

7.9 Percent of credit hours generated by nontraditional formats

7.10 Percent of transfers from CTCs (6 credits or more)

7.11 Percent employed while enrolled

7.12 Percent of graduates employed in chosen field five years after graduation

7.13 Percent of programs including representatives on advisory boards

7.14 Percent of graduates who have competence needed for specific industry clusters

7.15 Total degrees awarded by program in cluster area

7.16 Percent of operating expenditures for public service (IPEDS data)

7.17 Percent of programs with relevant employer representation on advisory boards

7.18 Percent of faculty engaged in public/community service activities

7.19 Percent of graduates seeking careers in the "helping" professions

7.20 Percent of courses taught by FT faculty

7.21 Persistence/Retention rate by ethnic/racial category

7.22 Amount of external or sponsored funds

Community-Technical Colleges

Goal 1: To enhance student learning and promote academic excellence		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
1.1 Written, oral, reading, and critical thinking skills upon completion of the general education core, students will demonstrate: • **Reading, writing, and oral communication skills;** • **An understanding of the key elements of artistic and literary expression;** • **An ability to locate, analyze, synthesize, and interpret information and to express ideas logically; and** • **An understanding of social issues**	Do graduates of degree programs evidence learning in written, oral, and reading skills?	To be determined
1.2 Performance on licensure exams Percent of graduates demonstrating in-depth understanding of an area of knowledge System Level Analysis: Number of recent graduates for whom successful completion of licensure exams is required for employment in a field related to the program of study. Number of graduates taking said exam and percent successfully completing the same. System Level Analysis: Connecticut Community-Technical College pass rates as compared to national average	Do students have the necessary knowledge to perform successfully on state licensure examinations and if so, how do the scores compare relative to national norms for community colleges?	Degree Program: Associate Degree granting occupational specific programs of Study. This category excludes all General Studies and Liberal Arts majors. Certificate Program: Certificate granting occupational specific programs of study.

Community-Technical Colleges

Goal 2: To join with elementary and secondary schools to improve teaching and learning at all levels		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
2.1 High school articulation Community college Tech Prep and High School Partnership agreements	How many high school articulation agreements exist among the community-technical colleges?	
2.2 Innovative projects with K-12 to transform and enrich educational opportunities	Do community-technical colleges support the CT K-12 system?	

Goal 3: To ensure access to and affordability of higher education		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
3.1a Real price to students to attend institution	Are Connecticut Community-Technical Colleges affordable?	Tuition and fees as percent of state median family income
3.1b Percent of operating expenditures from state support		General fund expenditures (including fringe) and operating fund expenditures, respectively, as a percent of total current fund expenditures
3.1c Percent of financial aid from federal support		Percent total financial aid expenditures supported by federal financial aid programs
3.2 Distance Education Opportunities	Are Connecticut Community-Technical Colleges removing barriers of time and place?	Number of distance education courses available

Community-Technical Colleges

Goal 4: To promote the economic development of the state and to help business and industry sustain economic growth		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
4.1 Annual headcount (duplicated) of credit-free students System Level Analysis: Number of students enrolled in all credit-free courses during the previous academic year (summer, winter, fall, and spring)	How many students participate in credit-free course offerings?	Duplicated Headcount: A learner can be enrolled in several courses during a year. The student is counted as many times as enrolled. Credit-Free Student: A learner taking courses offered by the community college not for academic credit. These include community service and continuing education courses.
4.2 Number of employers utilizing business and industry extension services System Level Analysis: How many companies are served through customized job training programs on an annual basis? System Level Analysis: How many people are trained utilizing these programs? System Level Analysis: What is the net revenue generated by these programs?	How many employers use Business and Industry Extension Services offered by the community-technical colleges?	
4.3 Programs to meet employer needs	Do community-technical colleges have programs designed to meet employer needs and to train and re-train the workforce?	

Community-Technical Colleges

Goal 5: To respond to the needs and problems of society		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
5.1a Basic skills reading, writing, and English System Level Analysis: Headcount of students enrolled in all basic skills reading, writing, and English courses during the most recent fall semester System Level Analysis: Grade distribution of students enrolled in all basic skills reading, writing, and English courses during the most recent fall semester. Percent passing with a C or better.	How many community-technical college students take at least one basic skills reading, writing, or English course and what percent pass with a grade of C or better?	Basic Skills (Reading): Any basic skills reading, writing, and English course as defined by the community-technical college's student information system, excluding ESL courses
5.1b Basic skills mathematics System Level Analysis: Headcount of students enrolled in all basic skills mathematics courses during the most recent fall semester System Level Analysis: Grade distribution of students enrolled in all basic skills mathematics courses during the most recent fall semester. Percent passing with a C or better.	How many community-technical college students take at least one basic skills math course and what percent pass with a grade of C or better?	Basic Skills (Mathematics): Any basic skills mathematics course as defined by the community-technical college's student information system
5.2a Sharing of resources with the community	Do community-technical colleges improve the quality of life in the communities they serve?	Colleges sponsor community activities ranging from health care the leadership development and enrichment programs for children
5.2b Provision of specialized services to the community		Colleges make their facilities available for community use

Community-Technical Colleges

Goal 6: To ensure the efficient use of resources		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
6.1 Percent of operating expenditures for instruction, public/ community service, academic support, student services, and student financial aid	Do the colleges use their resources in a cost-effective manner?	Percent of total current fund expenditures for direct instruction, public/ community service, academic support, student services, and student financial aid as defined by IPEDS
6.2 Faculty Productivity Student credit hours per faculty member	Do the colleges use their resources in a cost-effective manner?	Student Credit Hour: Number of credits per faculty member times number of students enrolled
6.3 Retention Rate System Level Analysis: Number of first time, full-time, degree seeking freshmen entering the Community-Technical college system during the most recent fall. Percent of students in this cohort returning the following fall.	Do entering student cohorts enrolled in a degree program return the following year?	First time freshmen: Students entering the system who have never taken any college courses for recognized academic credit, with the exception of credits earned while in high school (e.g., tech-prep, high school partnership, advanced placement, etc). Students who meet the above criteria, but entered college during the previous summer term are included. Full-time: Students enrolled in 12 or more credit hours, including basic skills courses Degree Seeking: Students with declared majors in Associate Degree granting programs of study

Community-Technical Colleges

Goal 6: To ensure the efficient use of resources		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
6.4 Graduation Rate System Level Analysis: Number of first time, full-time, degree seeking freshmen entering the Community-Technical college system during a specified fall semester. Percentage of those graduating within 150% of normal time. System Level Analysis: Number of first time, full-time, certificate seeking freshmen entering the Community college system during a specified fall semester. Percentage of those graduating within 150% of normal time.	What percent of first-time, full-time, degree/certificate seeking freshmen graduate from a community-technical college within 150% of normal time?	First time freshmen: Students entering the Community college system who have never taken any college courses for recognized academic credit, with the exception of credits earned while still in high school (e.g., tech-prep, high school partnership, advanced placement, etc). Students who meet the above criteria, but entered the community college system during the previous summer term are also included in this cohort. Full-time: Students enrolled in 12 or more credit hours, including basic skills courses Degree Seeking: Students with declared majors in Associate Degree granting programs of study Certificate Seeking: Students with declared majors in Certificate granting programs of study

Charter Oak State College

Goal 1: To enhance student learning and promote academic excellence		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
1.1 Graduate preparedness for employment	Do graduates have the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to successfully perform job responsibilities?	Graduates rate themselves and are rated by their employers on preparedness and performance in specific skills and knowledge areas
1.2 Graduate preparedness for continuing education or advanced degree program	Do graduates have the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to successfully complete their next degree or certification programs?	Graduates rate themselves and are rated by their advisors and other continuing education professionals on preparedness and performance in specific skills and knowledge areas
1.3 Percent of graduates passing licensure examinations	Do baccalaureate graduates have the necessary knowledge to perform successfully on licensure examinations?	As stated
1.4 Percent of graduates who report their education greatly enhanced their ability to: • **think analytically and logically** • **write effectively** • **use quantitative skills**	To what extent are graduates satisfied with the outcomes they received from their education?	Graduates indicate the impact of the COSC degree program on their progress toward and achievement of student learning goals

Goal 2: To join with elementary and secondary schools to improve teaching and learning at all levels		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
None		

Charter Oak State College

Goal 3: To ensure access to and affordability of higher education		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
3.1 Minority enrollment	Is COSC accessible to minority adults?	Percent of enrolled students who are in minority groups
3.2 Financial assistance	Is COSC accessible to adults with limited financial resources?	Percent of students whose financial needs are met through institution and private funds and federal SFA

Goal 4: To promote the economic development of the state and to help business and industry sustain economic growth		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
4.1 Graduate preparedness for employment	Do COSC graduates have the skills and knowledge necessary to maintain a workforce with contemporary skills?	Employers rate graduates on their preparedness and performance in specific skills and knowledge areas and indicate if additional skills are needed

Goal 5: To respond to the needs and problems of society		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
5.1 Percent of graduates seeking careers and enhancement of knowledge and skills in the helping professions	What is COSC's response to the needs and problems of society?	Graduates who completed concentrations in human services and related fields
5.2 Percent of non-business employers who are satisfied with competence of graduates	Are non-business employers satisfied with COSC graduates?	Employers rate graduates on their preparedness and performance in specific skills and knowledge areas

Charter Oak State College

Goal 6: To ensure the efficient use of resources		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
6.1 Total expenditures per student	Are COSC operations cost-effective with efficient use of resources?	Programmatic costs per students served and overall cost for serving enrolled students
6.2 Level of student satisfaction with programs, policies and services	Are COSC students satisfied with programs, policies and services?	As stated
6.3 Persistence rates	Does COSC offer programs and services to help adults persist towards a college degree?	Percent of students who have continued their enrollment or who have graduated one year after initial enrollment
6.4 Graduation rates	Does COSC offer programs and services that help adults achieve a college degree?	Percent of students who have graduated within six years after initial enrollment

Charter Oak State College
Strategic Performance Indicators

7.1 Increase enrollment

7.2 Increase participation in staff development activities to assure that the College maintains an institutional edge in relation to peer institutions

System Measures

Goal 1: To enhance student learning and promote academic excellence		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
1.1 Percent of CT high school graduates (public) enrolled in CT higher education	What portion of Connecticut public high school graduates choose to stay in-state to attend college?	The percent of CT high school graduating seniors (public) who indicate they plan to attend a CT college or university
1.2 Number of students enrolled in CT institutions of higher education per 100,000 residents, age 18 and older	How well do Connecticut institutions of higher education promote life-long learning and address the need to continually upgrade knowledge and skills?	The number of students enrolled, including full- or part-time students, taking courses for credit at any public or independent institution of higher education in Connecticut
1.3 Percent of employer satisfaction with system	Are Connecticut employers satisfied with the products and services of our higher education system?	The percent employers satisfied or very satisfied with overall system of higher education (probably from an index if funding provided)
1.4 Value of deferred maintenance liability in public higher education	Is Connecticut maintaining the quality of its physical infrastructure?	The estimated dollar value of deferred maintenance liability within CT public higher education facilities
1.5 Percent of Freshman that are CT Residents	How well do our institutions do in attracting in-state students to begin their higher education experience in Connecticut?	The total number of first time freshman who are Connecticut residents as a proportion of the total number of freshman in Connecticut public institutions of higher education

System Measures

Goal 2: To join with elementary and secondary schools to improve teaching and learning at all levels		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
2.1 College enrollment rate of ConnCap participants	How well do state early intervention programs work?	The number of ConnCap participants who gained acceptance to and enrolled in an institution of higher education as a percentage of the total number of ConnCap participants
2.2 Employment rate of Alternate Route to Certification participants	Are the alternative ways of certifying teachers to meet demand producing quality teachers?	The percentage of ARC graduates who get teacher jobs within one-year of program completion
2.3 Percent of CT colleges with formal feedback mechanisms	Are CT Colleges and Universities providing feedback to local schools on student performance?	The number of CT public colleges and universities that can demonstrate formal feedback mechanisms to K-12 systems as a percent of the total number of CT public colleges and universities
2.4 Percent of CT public four-year institutions that use CAPT test in admissions process	Are K-12 standards important for students who go onto CT public colleges?	The number of CT public four-year institutions that can demonstrate the use of the CAPT test in admissions decisions as a percent of the total number of public four-year institutions

System Measures

Goal 3: To ensure access to and affordability of higher education		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
3.1 Trends in state ranking of tuition and fees	Is Connecticut public higher education becoming more or less affordable?	Five-year trend in national ranking on average tuition and fees costs for public colleges by constituent unit
3.2 Trends in public college tuition and fee costs as a percent of median family income	Is Connecticut public higher education becoming more or less affordable when compared to changes in income levels?	Ten-year trend in public college tuition and fee costs as a percent of median family income
3.3 Change in the value of unmet financial aid need	Is the need for student financial aid being met?	Total financial need as measured by federal needs analyses minus grant and work-study aid available from all sources for public colleges (independents to be added if data available) with changes over time
3.4 Increase in minority enrollment and retention	Do Connecticut colleges attract and retain minority students?	Changes in the percentage of minority students enrolled in higher education and changes in the retention rates of minority students (possibly by sector)
3.5 Minority enrollment in higher education compared to state minority population	Does minority participation rates in CT higher education mirror the proportion of minorities in the state population?	Percentage minority enrollment in CT higher education compared to the percentage of minorities in CT's general population
3.6 Percent of operating budget from state support	Is Connecticut committed to providing affordable access to its public higher education system?	General fund support as a percentage of total higher education, excluding self-supporting auxiliary enterprises

System Measures

Goal 4: To promote the economic development of the state and to help business and industry sustain economic growth		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
4.1 Annual degrees conferred per 100,000 population compared to national average	How does CT compare in terms of producing an educated workforce?	Data is reported by the National Center for Education Statistics
4.2 Trends in degrees conferred by cluster areas	How well are our colleges and universities meeting the workforce demands of the state?	Five-year trend degrees conferred by cluster area
4.3 Education and Employment Information Center inquiries per 100,000 population	Can and do CT residents obtain up-to-date information about education and employment opportunities from higher education?	The annual number of logged EEIC inquiries per 100,000 population
4.4 Non-credit enrollment trends (when data available for the system as a whole)	Are Connecticut colleges and universities providing increased opportunities for life-long learning and short-term training needs?	Definition still being developed

Goal 5: To respond to the needs and problems of society		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
5.1 Percent of E&G budget devoted to public service	To what extent are higher education resources devoted to public service and community outreach activities?	Total expenditures for public service as a percent of total higher education expenditures
5.2 Increase in National Service member hours served	What impact do national community service initiatives have on Connecticut?	Trends in the number of member hours served

System Measures

Goal 6: To ensure the efficient use of resources		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
6.1 Educational costs per FTE student - trends and national ranking	Do Connecticut public colleges spend more or less than other states to provide educational services?	Educational Cost Per FTE Student as defined in the annual Research Associates of Washington survey. Trends in actual dollars and national rank
6.2 Average faculty salaries compared to peer institutions by constituent unit	How does Connecticut's faculty compensation rates compare to other states?	Peers will be identified using DHE PICS system. Average faculty salaries (all ranks) will be compared (actual basis and with regional cost of living factor)
6.3 Total private funds raised under the Higher Education Matching Grant Program	To what extent does Connecticut leverage public tax support to attract private investment?	The total dollar amount of endowment eligible gifts received by Connecticut public higher education each year
6.4 Student/faculty ratio compared to national average (two-year and four-year)	How efficiently do CT public institutions deliver direct instructional services?	Student/faculty ratios of each constituent unit compared to national averages published by the National Center of Education Statistics

Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges

Goal 1: To enhance student learning and promote academic excellence		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
1.1 Number of first time, full-time, degree seeking freshmen entering an independent college or university who receive a CICSG during the most recent fall. Percent of these students returning the following fall.	What portion of first time full-time students who receive the CICSG return the following year?	First time freshmen: Students entering an independent college or university who have never taken any college courses for recognized academic credit, with the exception of credits earned while still in high school Full-time: Students enrolled in 12 or more credit hours Degree Seeking: Students with declared majors in degree granting programs of study

Goal 2: To join with elementary and secondary schools to improve teaching and learning at all levels		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
None		

Goal 3: To ensure access to and affordability of higher education		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
3.1 Headcount enrollment of CICSG recipients by ethnic group during the most recent fall semester	What is the ethnic background of CICSG recipients?	
3.2 Break out by income level of CICSG recipients	What is family income of CICSG recipients?	
3.3 Break out by EFC for CICSG recipients	What is the Expected Family Contribution (EFC) of CICSG recipients?	

Goal 4: To promote the economic development of the state and to help business and industry sustain economic growth		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
4.1 Headcount enrollment during the most recent fall semester	How many students receive a CICSG?	

Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges

Goal 5: To respond to the needs and problems of society		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
5.1 Number of recipients participating in community service work/study opportunities during the previous academic year	What percentage of CICSG recipients perform community service as a component of the grant?	Community Service Work/Study Opportunities is referenced in the CICSG statute

Goal 6: To ensure the efficient use of resources		
Performance Indicators	**Clarification**	**Proposed Definition**
6.1 Average dollar amount of CICSG awards on an annual basis	What is the average CICSG award?	

III. Selection of Peer Institutions

The PMTF was very concerned that constituent units would be compared unfairly or inappropriately to one another when, in fact, their missions, program emphases and students are quite different. While the HECC recognized this concern, it questioned the external value of reporting completely different measures or, on the other hand, reporting similar measures in isolation and expecting comparisons among units not to be made by external readers. To address these concerns, it agreed with the PMTF's recommendation to find appropriate comparative data for as many measures as possible and to benchmark performance on these measures with those of comparable colleges and universities. It directed the PMTF to identify a specific set of comparative peers for each public institution.

The selection process is well underway, using a two-pronged approach. First, the PMTF endorsed a set of selection criteria using data readily available from the U.S. Department of Higher Education's Integrated Postsecondary Data System (IPEDS). The Department of Higher Education then used this data set to run statistical tests aimed at finding those institutions that most closely resemble each respective Connecticut institution. The selection criteria are described in Attachment C. At the same time, each unit was asked, if it so desired, to identify its own criteria and a list of peers to be compared with that produced by the statistical model. As of the writing of this report, the actual lists of peers is near completion. The PMTF will deliberate on these findings over the next few weeks and bring a recommendation to the Board of Governors in late February for its review and approval.

IV. Board of Governors' Recommendations

In endorsing the accountability measures recommended by the HECC, the Board of Governors made several important observations and recommendations. Most significantly, the Board asked that these measures be transmitted to the Education Committee with an explicit statement that these measures represent a solid first step in the right direction. However, the Board fully expects more work to be done and progress to be made in a number of areas. Specifically, the Board of Governors passed the following resolution:

RESOLVED *that the Board of Governors endorses the performance measures for the constituent units and public institutions of higher education with the exception that certain measures addressing strategic plan goals will be moved from Goals 1 to 6 to a separate section.*

In addition, it is recommended that each constituent unit consider other measures of progress on strategic initiatives and submit them to the Department of Higher Education in time for inclusion in the Commissioner's February report to the General Assembly.

It is further recommended that it be understood that the report is an initial document to be improved and expanded upon in future years, particularly in the following areas:

1. *Being responsive to the issue of distance education and giving it some parameters of discussion under performance measures*

2. *Making the information comprehensible to the public*

3. *Addressing technology learning and literacy and teacher education*

4. *Asking institutions to examine each other's measures or add measures in areas where new information can be developed*

It is expected that the PMTF, at the direction of the HECC, will address these issues over the next several months as indicated in the proposed timeline provided later in this report.

V. Assessing Student Learning Outcomes

Upon reviewing the early drafts of the proposed measures, it became very clear to the HECC that not enough of the measures focused on actual outcomes. In its view, too, many of the proposals are measures of inputs and activities. While it recognizes that some of these measures need to be used in the short run as a demonstration of commitment to accountability reporting, it believes that the long-range goal is to have accountability measures that are indicators of actual outcomes. In particular, the Council believes that the Connecticut public is very interested in ensuring attainment of educational or student learning outcomes.

To this end, the HECC unanimously committed itself to work on developing appropriate ways to measure actual student learning outcomes. In particular, the measures should be able to determine whether students have demonstrable competence in their ability to:

- think critically, analytically and logically
- write effectively
- communicate well orally
- use scientific and quantitative skills
- and acquire new skills and new knowledge on their own

These goals are consistent with the new, New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) standards for accreditation. However, the NEASC standards leave it up to individual institutions to demonstrate how they know students have achieved these competencies. It is the intention of the HECC to ensure more consistent, across-unit measurements and/or processes to determine competence levels. It has not ruled out the possibility of developing or adopting some usage of standardize testing.

The next immediate task of the HECC is to research outcome models and set out an action plan to begin development and implementation of student learning assessment tools. This will be a challenging task requiring full collegial engagement and significant investment of resources. The Connecticut State University already has committed itself to an aggressive, yet tentative, three-year timetable to address many of these areas. The Commissioner hopes to have a systemwide timetable developed by the end of March 2000.

VI. Next Steps

The next immediate steps with regard to the reporting of the measures developed thus far are summarized in the table (see Attachment D). The first priority is to identify peer institutions and begin the gathering and analysis of baseline data. A subcommittee of the PMTF will develop a draft reporting format. It is the Commissioner's intention to link the first reporting of accountability data with the next biennial budget process. The goal for the first institutional reports to be made early this fall (2000) is to include baseline data, benchmarking (peer) data and performance targets for as many measures as possible.

VII. Commissioner's Recommendations

Despite the many real and perceived impediments to accountability measurement voiced both within and outside the higher education community, the work of the PMTF, the HECC and the Board of Governors over the last seven months demonstrates that consistent commitment from state policymakers does make a difference. Collectively, we have set a new tone and direction, and have gained significant momentum in our efforts to focus our attention to performance improvement. The higher education community should applaud itself for these important first steps. The work, however, is far from done. In particular, we must develop better ways to assess actual student learning outcomes and demonstrate efficient use of resources particularly in respect to workforce and economic development. We also must benchmark our performance against our peers, and identify and implement changes to improve.

It is in this spirit that the following recommendations are made. They are intended to promote further advancement through incentives and sustained focus on performance improvement:

1. **Create a performance incentive pool for implementation in the first year of the next biennium that provides incentive funds to institutions based on progress in demonstrating performance and meeting performance goals.**

   Connecticut's public higher education system is too important to the state's future prosperity to base taxpayer support on input variables such as enrollments and numbers of faculty and staff, or historical support patterns, alone. We must focus on results the same way business and industry does, and the same ways other government enterprises are being asked to do. Connecticut higher education would be served well by following a path similar to the approach it has taken with its K-12 educational system: providing financial support and incentives based on performance goals and improvements.

   We know that a persistent focus on performance improvement, coupled with a financial incentive model at the state level, can and does work in Connecticut, as evidenced by the state's successful Minority Advancement Program. This model should be applied more broadly to the six statewide goals identified under Public Act 99-285. More specifically, the state should establish a performance-linked incentive pool of up to 5 percent of annual appropriations to higher education to provide additional state support to higher education based upon progress in implementing and meeting performance goals. The Board of Governors first recommended this strategy as part of its FY 1999-2001 biennial operating budget request. Continued commitment and progress on performance improvement toward established statewide priorities will be greatly enhanced if there are financial rewards and consequences attached.

2. **Refocus consolidated biennial budget request to emphasis performance improvement, incorporating results of accountability reports.**

   The Board of Governors' consolidated biennial operating and capital budgets and recommendations, while still providing critical financial information for each constituent and

unit, should emphasize performance improvement strategies. Its budget recommendations should be linked to the six statewide goals and the results contained in the institutional accountability reports. In this regard, C.G.S. 10a-8 should be expanded to allow the development of a performance-linked budgeting system in recognition that research commitment drives that attainment of goals.

3. **Link the review of these reports with biennial budgeting process**

   The Commissioner believes strongly that to encourage continued focus on performance improvement and recent changes, accountability reports must inform and be tied to the budgetary process and resource allocation decisions. In this regard, it is recommended that the first reports on the accountability measures be made in early fall 2000 to coincide with the submission of the biennial operating and capital budget requests to the Governor as required under C.G.S. Sections 4-77, 4-78 and 10a-8. Annual reporting should be linked thereafter to the budget process cycle, including any mid-biennial budget adjustment processes.

4. **Eliminate the statutory biennial assessment report requirement and replace it with annual accountability measurement reports**

   While the biennial assessment reports required under C.G.S. Sec.10a-156 provided an important opportunity for institutions to assess progress, the reports were limited in their usefulness to external audiences. First, they were simply too long for people to read and digest. Second, it was extremely difficult to attain a reasonable level of consistency in format and content detail without being overly regulatory. Finally, the reports required a significant investment of institutional time just to write but did not focus on measurements of progress. The Commissioner believes this time could be better spent on more streamlined, quantitative reporting that focuses on comparative measurement against goals.

Each unit and institution has identified how it can and must assess progress. Through new performance funding, the state will evidence its commitment to realizing goals and hold the higher education system to excellence.

Department of Higher Education
Performance Measures Task Force

Dr. Corby Coperthwaite
Director of Institutional Research
Manchester Community-Technical College
60 Bidwell Street
Manchester, CT 06040
Tel: 860/647-6101 Fax: 860/647-6332
Email: MA_Corby@commnet.edu

Ms. Dee Coviello
Director of Institutional Research
Charter Oak State College
55 Paul Manafort Drive
New Britain, CT 06053
Tel: 860/666-4595x22 Fax: 860/666-4852
Email: Dcoviello@commnet.edu

Dr. Dennis DeLong
Executive Officer for Academic Programs
Connecticut State University
39 Woodland Street
Hartford, CT 06105
Tel: 860/493-0074 Fax: 860/493-0080
Email: DeLongD@sysoff.ctstateu.edu

Dr. Karla Fox
Associate Vice Chancellor
University of Connecticut
352 Mansfield Rd., Gulley Hall, U-86
Storrs, CT 06269
Tel: 860/486-4037 Fax: 860/486-6379
Email: Karla@Chance.vpa.uconn.edu

Mr. Marc Fowler
Associate Vice Chancellor Finance & Comptroller
UConn Health Center
263 Farmington Avenue
Farmington, CT 06030
Tel: 860/679-3152 Fax: 860/679-4014
Email: Marc@adp.uchc.edu

Ms. Judy Greiman
President
Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges
342 North Main Street, Suite 202
West Hartford, CT 06117
Tel: 860/236-0900 Fax: 860/236-0910
Email: GreimanJ@theccic.org

Dr. Karen Sue Grosz
Academic Officer
Community-Technical Colleges
61 Woodland Street
Hartford, CT 06105
Tel: 860/725-6612 Fax: 860/566-1308
Email: Grosz@commnet.edu

Mr. Karim J. Ladha
Director of Planning and Research
Community-Technical Colleges
61 Woodland Street
Hartford, CT 06105
Tel: 860/725-6687 Fax: 860/566-1308
Email: Ladhak@commnet.edu

Dr. Dimitrios Pachis
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Eastern Connecticut State University
85 Windham Street
Willimantic, CT 06226
Tel: 860/465-5246 Fax: 860/465-4485
Email: pachis@ecsuc.ctstateu.edu

Dr. Kent W. Smith
Director of Institutional Research
Trinity College
300 Summit Street
Hartford, CT 06106
Tel: 860/297-5195 Fax: 860/297-4202
Email: Kent.Smith@trincoll.edu

Dr. Scott Wetstone
Assistant Dean
School of Medicine
UConn Health Center
263 Farmington Avenue
Farmington, CT 06030-1910
Tel: 860/679-4440 Fax: 860/679-2374
Email: Wetstone@nso.uchc.edu

Dr. Alan Sturtz
Director, IR
Academic Affairs
Connecticut State University
39 Woodland Street
Hartford, CT 06105
Tel: 860/493-0023 Fax: 860/493-0080
Email: sturtza@sysoff.ctstateu.edu

DHE Staff:

Mary Johnson, Project Leader
Tel: 860/947-1848 Fax: 860/947-1310
Email: Mkjohnson@commnet.edu

Jan Lyddon
Tel: 860/947-1842 Fax 860/947-1311
Email: Jlyddon@commnet.edu

John Walters
Tel: 860/947-1823 Fax: 860/947-1310
Email: Wpwalters@commnet.edu

Jonas Zdanys
Tel: 860/947-1836 Fax: 860/947-1310
Email: Jzdanys@commnet.edu

Attachment B

NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS & COLLEGES, INC.
COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Policy Statement on Institutional Effectiveness

In revising its standards for accreditation, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education has reaffirmed the importance of each institution measuring its effectiveness. An institution's efforts and ability to assess its effectiveness and use the obtained information for its improvement are important indicators of institutional quality. The Commission, through its evaluative processes, will appraise these quality indicators. Just as assessment is now a pervasive theme throughout the revised standards, so too should it be a theme in all comprehensive self-studies.

The Commission views such assessment as a means of enhancing institutional effectiveness. The assessment process requires the gathering and analysis of evidence of congruence between an institution's stated mission, purposes, and objectives and the actual outcomes of its programs and activities. In order to inform its planning, decision-making, and resource allocation, an institution needs to determine how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its mission and purposes. Moreover, the institution needs documentary evidence to support assertions of quality made in its self-study and in its communications with its constituencies.

The commission expects each institution, as part of its dedication to institution improvement, to monitor its effectiveness in achieving its mission and purposes. Accordingly, the institution collects and analyzes relevant data and uses this information in the institutional planning process as a basis for sustaining quality and self-improvement. Thus, assessment functions as a tool for the encouragement of such improvement as well as a basis for quality assurance.

There is no one best way to assess institutional effectiveness, and the Commission prescribes no formula that an institution must use for measuring or demonstrating its effectiveness. Assessment efforts will vary among different types of institutions as well as among institutions of the same type. Successful assessment efforts are compatible with the institution's mission and its available resources.

Assessment is not a one-time activity; rather, it is evolutionary, ongoing, and incremental. The Commission realizes that an institution initially engaging in assessment will be likely to do so on a limited basis. However, it expects that in due time its assessment efforts will be more comprehensive, systematic, integrative, and organic. Regardless of their scope, these efforts will be both qualitative and quantitative. Assessment does not require standardized or even professionally developed instruments or complicated methods of statistical analysis.

While assessment is an overall institutional concern, as reflected in the various standards for accreditation, its primary focus is the teaching-learning experience. To the greatest extent possible, therefore, the institution should describe explicit achievements expected of its students and adopt reliable procedures for assessing those achievements.

Ultimately, assessment and accreditation share the common goal of enabling the institution to reach its fullest academic potential by providing the highest quality education possible. In pursuing that goal, institutional autonomy should be preserved, innovation encouraged, and the distinct character of each institution recognized and honored.

January 22, 1992

New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc.
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education

Standards for Accreditation:
Excerpts related to Institutional Effectiveness

Preamble

Institutions of higher learning achieve accreditation from the New England Association through its Commission on Institutions of Higher Education by demonstrating they meet the Commission's Standards for Accreditation and comply with its policies. The Standards for Accreditation establish minimum criteria for institutional quality. In addition, the Commission adopts policies which elucidate the Standards and relate to their application. *Moreover, the Commission expects affiliated institutions to work toward improving their quality, increasing their effectiveness, and continually striving toward excellence.* [Emphasis added.] Its evaluative processes are designed to encourage such improvement.

Standard One
Mission and Purposes

1.4 Drawing upon its ongoing efforts to assess its effectiveness, the institution periodically re-evaluates the content and pertinence of its statement of mission and purposes. The results are regularly used in planning and resource allocation to enhance its efforts to achieve institutional purposes.

Standard Two
Planning and Evaluation

2.1 The institution undertakes planning and evaluation appropriate to its needs to accomplish and improve the achievement of its mission and purposes.

2.2 Planning and evaluation are systematic, broad-based, interrelated, and appropriate to the institution's circumstances. They involve the participation of individuals and groups responsible for the achievement of institutional purposes. The institution allocates sufficient resources for its planning and evaluation efforts.

2.4 The institution evaluates the achievement of its mission and purposes, giving primary focus to the realization of its educational objectives. Its evaluative procedures are appropriate and effective for addressing its unique circumstances. To the extent possible, evaluation enables the institution to demonstrate through verifiable means its attainment of purposes and objectives both inside and outside the classroom.

2.6 The institution determines the effectiveness of its planning and evaluation activities on an ongoing basis. Results of these activities are used to revise and further enhance the institution's implementation of its purposes and objectives.

See Commission Policy on Institutional Effectiveness

Standard Three
Organization and Governance

3.9 The institution periodically evaluates the effectiveness of its system of governance using the results for its improvement.

Standard Four
Programs and Instruction

4.4 The institution undertakes academic planning and evaluation to achieve and, where possible, to enhance the achievement of program objectives. These activities are realistic and take into account stated goals and available resources. The institution allocates human, financial, and physical resources on the basis of its academic plans, needs, and objectives. It recognizes and takes account of the increased demands on resources made by programs offered at a higher degree level.

4.5 As part of its overall planning and evaluation, the institution develops, approves, administers, and periodically reviews its degree programs under established, clearly defined, and effective institutional policies which are demonstrably implemented by designated bodies with clearly established channels of communication and control. The faculty has a substantive responsibility for the design and execution of the curriculum. The evaluation of existing programs includes an assessment of their effectiveness and continued need. Additions and deletions of programs or courses are consistent with available resources, faculty expertise, student needs, and academic planning. Curricular planning and evaluation take into account the role of the multiple resources required for the development and improvement of academic programs.

4.19 Graduates successfully completing an undergraduate program demonstrate competence in written and oral communication in English; the ability for scientific and quantitative reasoning, for critical analysis and logical thinking; and the capability for continuing learning. They also demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific, historical, and social phenomena, and a knowledge and appreciation of the aesthetic and ethical dimensions of humankind. In addition, graduates demonstrate an in-depth understanding of an area of knowledge or practice and of its interrelatedness with other areas.

4.25 Students who successfully complete a graduate program demonstrate that they have acquired the knowledge and developed the skills that are identified as the program's objectives.

4.30 The institution endeavors to enhance the quality of teaching. It encourages experimentation with methods to improve instruction. The effectiveness of instruction is periodically and systematically assessed using adequate and reliable procedures; the results are used to improve instruction. Adequate support is provided to accomplish this task.

Standard Five
Faculty

5.11 The faculty are demonstrably effective in carrying out their assigned responsibilities. The institution employs effective procedures for the regular evaluation of faculty appointments, performance, and retention. The evaluative criteria reflect the mission and purposes of the institution and the importance it attaches to the various responsibilities of faculty members, e.g., teaching, scholarship, creative activities, research, and professional and community service. The institution has equitable and broad-based procedures for such evaluation, in which its expectations are stated clearly and weighted appropriately for use in the evaluative process.

Standard Six
Student Services

6.11 Through a program of regular and systematic evaluation, the institution determines whether the co-curricular goals and needs of the students are being met. Information obtained through this evaluation is used to revise these goals and improve their achievement.

Standard Seven
Library and Information Resources

7.6 The institution regularly and systematically evaluates the adequacy and utilization of its library and information resources, and uses the results of the data to improve and increase the effectiveness of these services.

Standard Eight
Physical Resources

8.3 The institution undertakes physical resource planning which is linked to academic and student services and financial planning. It determines the adequacy of existing physical resources and identifies and plans the specified resolution of deferred maintenance needs. Space planning occurs on a regular basis as part of physical resource evaluation and planning, and is consistent with the mission and purposes of the institution.

Standard Nine
Financial Resources

9.6 The institution's financial records clearly relate to its educational activities. The financial resources and transactions of independent institutions are audited annually by an external auditor in accord with the generally accepted auditing standards for colleges and universities as adopted by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. When public institutions are, by law, audited by a state agency, an independent audit is not required except for any funds not subject to governmental audit. In either case, the audit is appropriately reviewed by the institution's administration and the resulting recommendations or conclusions are addressed by the institution's financial planning. The institution also has in place appropriate internal mechanisms to evaluate its financial management.

Standard Ten
Public Disclosure

10.10 Through a systematic process of periodic review, the institution ensures that its publications are accurate and current.

Standard Eleven
Integrity

11.10 The institution periodically assesses the effectiveness of its ethical policies and procedures and demonstrates that mechanisms exist for the effective implementation of its principles.

January 22, 1992

Peer Institution Selection Criteria:

In developing a set of comparative institutions, the Department began by reviewing the literature on selection of peer institutions, and then identified potential data variables on which such peers could be analyzed and then selected. The selected variables were designed to capture an array of comparative information, but from a readily available and standardized source. Thus, all data were obtained from federal IPEDS[1] sources. The selected data variables, described below, were reviewed with the Performance Measures Task Force for comment and eventual concurrence.

The first selection criteria was the institution's Carnegie classification. This system groups institutions by mission, level of degrees offered and research emphasis. For each grouping, a separate data set was then created containing the selected data elements for each public institution in that class. The University of Connecticut had 85 institutions in its the initial data set, Connecticut State University had 249 institutions (including each of the four CSU campuses), and the Community-Technical Colleges data set included 963 institutions (including each of the 12 Connecticut CTCs). Institutions that had a significant number of missing data elements were eliminated from the data sets, bringing the total numbers down to 78 for UConn, 212 for CSU and 658 for the CTCs.

The other selection criteria are listed below. The corresponding data elements were taken from the WEDS collections and averaged over three years to screen out extremes or to allow for changes:

- ***Total FTE enrollment***, from 1994-95 to 1996-97. FTE enrollment is calculated by adding 100% of full time enrollment and one-third of part time enrollment. This variable is a measure of institutional size.
- ***Percent part time undergraduate enrollment***. This variable is based on headcount and is intended to approximate the commuter or residential character of the institution.
- ***Percent part time graduate enrollment***. The variable is based on headcount, and is an indicator of traditional/nontraditional graduate programs.
- ***Percent FTE who are graduate students***. This variable indicates complexity and mission of the institution.
- ***Total Educational and General (E and G) expenditures per FTE student***. This variable shows resource availability.
- ***Program mix***. The variable is designed to indicate the array of academic offering and their similarity to Connecticut institutions. It was developed by obtaining a correlation coefficient from the three-year average of the number of degrees granted within each two-digit Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) discipline.
- ***Percent of faculty who are full-time***. This is based on total faculty headcount, and is intended to show faculty resources.

---

[1] IPEDS is the federal government reporting that all colleges and universities participate in annually. It collects data on enrollment, degrees granted, faculty and staff, finances, and basic institutional characteristics.

- ***Number of full-time library staff per 1,000 FTE students.*** This variable is only collected every other year, so only two years of data were available for the average. The variable is designed to indicate the availability of other important educational resources.
- ***Percent of enrollment who are minority students.*** This variable is designed to indicate diversity of population served.

Each selection criteria was weighted equally, meaning that no one variable was deemed more important than the others. Statistical analyses currently are underway to determine which institutions most closely resemble each Connecticut public institution. From a rank-ordered listing of similar institutions, a peer group of 10 to 15 institutions will be selected for each institution.

Public Act 99-285 Timeline of Next Steps

	Task	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October
1	Submission of First Progress Report to Education Committee									
2	Selection of Peer Institutions									
3	Approval of Peer Institutions by Board of Governors									
4	Gathering and Analysis of Baseline Performance Data									
5	Gathering and Analysis of Peer Data									
6	Establishment of Initial Improvement Goals									
7	Student Learning Outcomes Implementation Plan									
8	Board of Governors Forum on Student Learning Assessment									
9	Implementation of Pilot Student Learning Assessment Tools									
10	Revamp Budget Guidelines to Focus of Performance									
11	Development of Draft Reporting Format									
12	Review of Draft Reporting Format by Board of Governors									
13	Institutional Development of First Reports									
14	Submission of First Accountability Reports									